

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,362	03/22/2004	Thierry Glauser	50623.351	3954
45159 SOLURE SAN	7590 07/23/201 NDERS & DEMPSEY I	EXAMINER		
1 MARITIME PLAZA SUITE 300 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			HELM, CARALYNNE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/807,362	GLAUSER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CARALYNNE HELM	1615		

	CARALYNNE HELM	1615	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la 	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhunder 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any pely received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete.	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	appeal. Since a
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		cted claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1.1.4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12.			DTOL 204)
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		npliant Amendment (i	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	orrabio il dabrillica il a doparato, i	mony mod amonamon	it our our ing the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 43-55.62 and 103-115. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-42 and 66-99.			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:	ered but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for a	allowance
See Continuation Sheet.			
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. ☐ Other:			

/Caralynne Helm/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/Juliet C Switzer/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment narrows the scope of the invention and therefore requires an additional search of the prior art in order to be fully considered.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' remarks and arguments concerning the rejections made under 35 USC 103(a) and 35 USC 112, second paragraph are directed toward the unentered amendment and for this reason are moot. Applicants' remarks regarding the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for "new matter" is noted, as is the lack of arguments directed toward the rejection under this same statute for enablement. Both of these rejections are maintained. Although one ordinary skill in the art could appreciate substituted epsilon-capitolation and substituted best-buryolations are maintained. Although one cordinary skill in the art could appreciate substituted epsilon-capitolation and substituted pesilon-capitolation and substituted best-buryolatione, and hydroxyl epsilon-capitolation deepicted as components of the claimed biocompatible polymer, components derived from these indications, components of the claimed biocompatible polymer, components derived from these indications of the claimed compounds do not have adequate basis in the disclosure as filed. The "derived from "terminology embraces far more than participation of the claimed compounds (in protected from) as monomers in a polymerization. Applicants do not teach any synthetic pathways, other than protection of a hydroxyl group, that are envisioned for generating derivatives. Thus it is not clear that applicants had possession of the full breadth of claims 103-115 at the time of the invention.